

**UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL
on
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

**IN RE: JUUL LABS, INC., MARKETING, SALES
PRACTICES, AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2913

(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)


CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO –86)

On October 2, 2019, the Panel transferred 5 civil action(s) to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. *See* 396 F.Supp.3d 1366 (J.P.M.L. 2019). Since that time, 288 additional action(s) have been transferred to the Northern District of California. With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable William H. Orrick, III.

It appears that the action(s) on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the Northern District of California and assigned to Judge Orrick.

Pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, the action(s) on the attached schedule are transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to the Northern District of California for the reasons stated in the order of October 2, 2019, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable William H. Orrick, III.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 7 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 7-day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.



FOR THE PANEL:



John W. Nichols
Clerk of the Panel

**IN RE: JUUL LABS, INC., MARKETING, SALES
PRACTICES, AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2913

SCHEDULE CTO-86 – TAG-ALONG ACTIONS

<u>DIST</u>	<u>DIV.</u>	<u>C.A.NO.</u>	<u>CASE CAPTION</u>
OHIO SOUTHERN			
OHS	2	22-02625	Estate of Emily Reardon, James Reardon Administrator v. Monsees et al